

**Habitat Project Ranking Criteria
2009 Federal Funding Cycle**

I. CONSERVATION OF SUSTAINABLE POPULATIONS	Points = 105
<i>I.1 Does the project contribute to conservation of federally or state listed, recreationally and economically important species?</i>	Maximum = 30
Federally or state listed endangered, threatened, or special concern species	
>2 species = 15	
2 species = 10	
1 species = 5	
Recreationally and/or economically important species (not also federally or state listed or of special concern)	
>2 species = 15	
2 species = 10	
1 species = 5	
<i>I.2 Does the project build upon previously funded SARP projects?</i>	Maximum = 5
Yes = 5	
No = 0	
<i>I.3 Does the project support habitat conservation goals of State Conservation Management Plans?</i>	Maximum = 15
>2 states and >2 goals = 15	
2 states and 1 goal or 1 state and 2 goals = 10	
1 state and 1 goal = 5	
<i>I.4 What is the probability of long-term success of the project?</i>	Maximum = 20
High: Conservation action will result in long-term benefit and applicant demonstrates commitment to adaptive management and regular maintenance, if necessary = 20	
Medium: Conservation action will result in moderate-term benefit and applicant demonstrates commitment to adaptive management and regular maintenance, if necessary = 15	
Medium low: Conservation action will result in short-term benefit and applicant demonstrates commitment to adaptive management and regular maintenance, if necessary = 10	
Low: Conservation action will result in short-term benefit, but applicant does not demonstrate commitment to adaptive management and regular maintenance, if necessary = 5	
None: Conservation action is unlikely to result in any benefit and the applicant does not demonstrate a commitment to adaptive management and regular maintenance, if necessary = 0	
<i>I.5 Can major aspects of the project be completed within 12 months of receiving funding? (excluding monitoring and evaluation)</i>	Maximum = 10
Yes = 10	
No = 0	

<i>I.6 Does the project address the cause(s) of watershed degradation or habitat loss?</i>	Maximum = 25
Addresses all (100%) causes = 25	
Addresses many (75-99%) causes, to include the root cause = 20	
Addresses some (26-74%) causes, to include the root cause = 15	
Addresses some (26-74%) causes, but does not include the root cause = 10	
Addresses few (1-25 %) causes = 5	
Addresses no causes = 0	
II. MANAGEMENT ASSETS	Points = 50
<i>II.1 Is evaluation and monitoring included in the proposal? (Parameters should be included such that success can be gauged and performance metrics (e.g., actual acres or miles restored) can be documented.)</i>	Maximum = 20
>3-year period of monitoring and evaluation included = 20	
>1-3-year period of monitoring and evaluation included = 15	
1-year period of monitoring and evaluation included = 10	
<1-year period of monitoring and evaluation included = 5	
No monitoring and evaluation included = 0	
<i>II.2 What is the level of public access/visibility?</i>	Maximum =15
Unlimited access/visibility = 15	
Limited access/visibility (e.g., Only on week days) = 10	
Minimal visibility (e.g., only few days per year, largely for visibility or outdoor classroom demonstrations) = 5	
No access or discriminated access (e.g., On a hunting/fishing club and only accessible by members) = 0	
<i>II.3 Does the project contribute to the education and outreach goals of SARP; have value as a demonstration project; or have great potential to foster/generate a community conservation ethic through citizen involvement?</i>	Maximum = 15
High (e.g., long-term, far reaching education, actively managed websites, active outdoor classrooms, permanent kiosks) = 15	
Medium (e.g., lengthy media coverage, periodic outdoor classrooms, high distribution manuscript/journals/pamphlet) = 10	
Low (e.g., one time news release or low distribution manuscript/journals/pamphlet) = 5	
None = 0	
III. PARTNERSHIPS AND PROJECT LEVERAGING	Points = 60
<i>III.1 What is the Cost to Benefit Ratio: measured in acres or miles of stream, open water, riparian, wetland, and associated upland in the watershed directly restored within the project footprint? (Cost to Benefit Ratio shall be calculated by dividing project cost by the metric. Projects in major metropolitan areas should apply 75% of the project cost in determining the cost to benefit ratio.)</i>	Maximum = 20
<\$10,000/mile/ac = 20	
\$10,000-\$30,000/mile/ac = 15	
>\$30,000-100,0000/mile /ac = 10	
>\$100,000/mile/ac = 0	

<i>III.2 Does project restore/enhance unique habitat that has a high per acre/mile value (e.g., cool water habitat for striped bass, spawning habitat for anadromous or riverine species, coastal marsh/reef for estuarine fish.)</i>	Maximum = 10
Yes = 10	
No = 0	
<i>III.3 What amount of funds are leveraged from other sources?</i>	Maximum = 10
>2:1 = 10	
2:1 = 7	
1:1-1.9:1 = 5	
<1:1 = 3	
No leveraging = 0	
<i>III.4 How many partners are involved in the project?</i>	Maximum = 5
>4 = 5	
3-4 = 3	
1-2 = 1	
0 = 0	
<i>III.5 Are there unique partnership aspects (e.g., local school, scout troop, disabled group, angler association, industry, recreational group) associated with the project?</i>	Maximum = 5
Yes = 5	
No = 0	
<i>III.6 Is the project located within one or more of the interim geographic priorities as identified in the Southeast Aquatic Habitat Plan?</i>	Maximum = 10
Yes = 10	
No = 0	